

# MINUTES

## P & Z COMMISSION HEARING

October 17, 2002

### ATTENDANCE

#### P & Z Commissioners

#### ATTENDED

1. Jon Olson, Chairman
2. Frank Damato
3. Wendell DeCross
4. Claire Heywood
5. John Dalton
6. Tommy Joe

#### ABSENT

Roy Solomon  
Gary Nelson  
Drew Shumway

#### Staff Attendance

1. David Ashton, Director
2. Lissa Davis, Planner II
3. Lance Payette, Deputy County Attorney
4. Tom Hieb, Deputy Director of Flood Control

Meeting held at the Board of Supervisors Chambers, Holbrook, Arizona - Time 6:52 p.m.

Jon Olson called the meeting of the Navajo County Planning & Zoning Commission to order, and explained the meeting procedures to the public and then led the Pledge of Allegiance

Item #1 **SPECIAL USE PERMIT**: Discussion and possible Commission action on a request by **Brent & Caryn Schumaker** to allow for the storage of construction equipment, materials, vehicles, and supplies on the subject property, APN: 211-04-006D, E, F, in T9N, R22E, Section 4, in the Lakeside area. **Lissa Davis** gave a history of the project and presented maps showing the general area and the site plan. Ms. Davis explained that the Planning and Zoning Commission originally heard the application at their regular meeting in January 2002. Ms. Davis reminded the commission at that time the commission voted unanimously to deny the application. Ms. Davis explained that Mr. Schumaker requested that the item be placed on a future Planning & Zoning agenda to be revisited after he made the efforts required to respond to the opposition of an adjacent property owner. Ms. Davis stated that Mr. Schumaker now believes he had addressed those concerns and would like the commission to revisit his request. The stated reason for this request is to allow for the storage of construction business related equipment, supplies, and vehicles on the subject property. Public Works comments are that there are no known drainage or flooding concerns that would preclude issuing the proposed Special Use Permit. There are no County maintained or Primitive Roads that will be directly affected by the granting of this request. Ms. Davis showed on the map the people who contacted her who were in favor of the project and those in opposition. Staff recommends approval with stipulations. **Steven Bergsdon** is the attorney representing Brent & Caryn Schumaker. Mr. Bergsdon spoke about the Schumaker's background. Mr. Bergsdon indicated that Brent Schumaker is a licensed Arizona Contractor and has a Class A General Contracting License. Mr. Bergsdon told how the Schumaker's developed their property and has been instrumental in providing for the infrastructure on a variety of home sites and homes. Mr. Bergsdon said that Mr. Schumaker would be willing to maintain Howling Wolf Lane and to combine his lots. Mr. Bergsdon told the commission that in the past the Adjarians were opposed to the project but in their packet is a letter from Penny Adjarian stating that she no longer opposing the Special Use Permit. Mr. Bergsdon then presented the commission with pictures taken of the neighborhood. **Brent Schumaker** is the applicant and he was in attendance. Mr. Schumaker asked the commissioners to take the facts and the findings presented to them and issue them a Special Use Permit. Mr. Schumaker commented on how he has resided at his property for ten years and how he enjoys his neighborhood. Mr. Schumaker also commented on how he will continue to maintain the road in the winter. **Richard Goldstein** spoke in favor of the project. Mr. Goldstein resides on the Northern corner of Deer Run Road and Howling Wolf. Mr. Goldstein indicated that he is impacted on the Deer Run Side and the Howling Wolf side (showed on the map

where he resides). Mr. Goldstein explained how people driving down the road in their passenger vehicles speeding, kicks up more dust than Mr. Schumaker's truck or his equipment. Mr. Goldstein commented on how Mr. Schumaker uses his grader to maintain the county road at his own expense, and how he plowed several people's driveways when there was a snowstorm, also at his own expense. In Mr. Goldstein's opinion the Schumakers are a benefit to the neighborhood and requested that the Special Use Permit be approved. **Loretta Griswold** spoke in favor of this project. Ms. Griswold stated that she resides at 396 Deer Run Road (staff showed on the map where she resides). Ms. Griswold stated that she knew about Mr. Schumaker's construction business when they purchased the property. Ms. Griswold commented that they had no problems with the Schumakers. Ms. Griswold also commented that she hardly hears any noise from the truck or the equipment and asked the commissioners to approve the Special Use Permit. **Corbet Bagley** spoke in favor of the project. Mr. Bagley indicated that he resides at 409 Deer Run Road (staff showed on the map where he resides). Mr. Bagley expressed his appreciation to Mr. Schumaker for maintaining the road. Mr. Bagley indicated that he has more problems with the ATV's and United Parcel Service than with Mr. Schumaker's vehicle and equipment. **Pearl Wallace** spoke in favor of the project. Ms. Wallace stated that she resides at 9248 Morgan Mountain Drive (staff showed on the map where she resides). Ms. Wallace indicated that she has resided in the neighborhood for 35 years and Mr. Schumaker has been an asset to the neighborhood. **Mary Lou Van Deman** spoke in opposition to this project. Ms. Van Deman showed on the map where her property is located. Ms. Van Deeman expressed her displeasure at the dirt, dust, noise and the large equipment that goes past their house. Ms. Van Deeman stated that the large equipment travels not at the speed limit of 25 miles per hour. Ms. Van Deeman stated that a construction yard should not be placed in a residential area since this is a commercial venture. **Clarence Van Deeman** spoke in opposition regarding this project. Mr. Van Deeman also voiced his displeasure pertaining to the noise and dust and the possible devaluation of his property. Mr. Van Deeman commented on how Mr. Schumaker had bladed the road only twice and that is prior to coming to the Planning and Zoning meeting. Mr. Van Deeman commented that he does not understand why the commission would let a commercial venture be placed in a residential area. Mr. Van Deeman stated at the last meeting that the county attorney said that this was illegal. Mr. Van Deeman gave his opinion that the attorney's instruction was the reason why the commission voted unanimously to deny the Special Use Permit. **Steve Bergstem** presented a photograph to the commissioners of Mr. Van Deeman's son's property, which is located in a similar area. What was depicted in the photograph is a tractor trailer (semi). Mr. Bergstem commented on the fact that once the applicant has come to the Planning and Zoning Commission and the applicant has done everything that he possibly could to address the concerns of the department. Mr. Bergstem commented on the fact that they have one person in the entire subdivision voicing his opposition. Mr. Bergstem stated that the applicant meets the criteria and recommendation for a Special Use Permit. **Lance Payette** explained on the previous Planning and Zoning Meeting the County Ordinance requires that anytime that you grant a Special Use Permit that you will have specific evidence in front of you, and make specific findings, that the public health, safety and welfare will not be adversely effected. Mr. Payette indicated at the last meeting that they did not have any evidence that would allow them to make the findings that you need to make to grant a Special Use Permit. Mr. Payette reminded the commission that the issue is the proposed use of the property and whether the commission feels it will adversely affect the neighborhood. **Frank Damato** expressed concerns with the Ordinance in Section 2002. Mr. Damato indicated that the only evidence that he sees that was presented to protect the public health, safety and general welfare is that the applicant is suppose to be driving at 20 miles a hour. Mr. Damato stated that since they previously denied this, nothing has changed to support the fact that everything will be okay. **John Dalton** remarked that he has a problem with commercial use being in the residential area. Mr. Dalton stated that this is definitely a commercial use. **Dave Ashton** commented that on stipulation number two that the Special Use Permit is valid for two years. Mr. Ashton asked the commission if they were more comfortable with them doing an annual review. A motion was made by **Claire Heywood** to approve the Special Use Permit with stipulation stated by staff. Ms. Heywood asked that stipulation number two be amended so that the Special Use Permit shall be valid for one year from the date of the Board of Supervisors approval and be renewable after an annual review and inspection by staff to confirm continued compliance with the stipulations. **Recommended Stipulations:** *1. This Special Use Permit shall be valid only for the current owner of the land. 2. The Special Use Permit shall be valid for one year from the date of Board of Supervisors approval and renewable after an annual review and inspection by staff to confirm continued compliance with the stipulations. 3. The permitted Special Use Permit shall be allowed to occur only in the location shown on the approved site plan. Any expansion of the Special Use Permit shall require and amendment to this Permit. 4. All vehicles kept on the property shall be operable. 5. All vehicles, construction equipment, supplies and materials shall be placed behind a nontransparent fence or wall six feet in height. 6. Applicant shall take measures to minimize damage to and manage dust control of Howling Wolf Lane. 7. Applicant shall combine the lots into one.* **Wendell DeCross** seconded the motion. **Tommy Joe, Claire Heywood, Wendell DeCross** and **Jon Olson** voted in favor of the motion. **Frank Damato** and **John Dalton** voted against the motion. Motion carried.

**Lillie** to approve the Master Development Site Plan for the subject parcel (11.83 acres), APN: 206-27-014F, T12N, R17E, Section 33, in the Heber/Overgaard area. **Lissa Davis** asked that **Item number two be continued.**

**ITEM #3 ZONE CHANGE & MASTER DEVELOPMENT SITE PLAN:** Discussion and possible Commission action on a request by **Steve Kohner** to approve the Master Development Site Plan and to change the zoning classification of subject parcel (161.43 acres) from A-General to Special Development Zoning District for the proposed multi and single-family residential development. APN: 212-05-007A & B, T9N, R22E, Section 8, in the Wagon Wheel area.

**Lissa Davis** gave a history of the project and presented maps showing the general area and site plans. The stated reason for this request is to approve a Master Development Site Plan and to change the Zoning Classification of the subject parcel (161.43 acres), from A-General Zoning District to Special Development Zoning District for the proposed Kohner Addition Development. This would allow for the development of a subdivision with mixed housing units. The Engineering Division has submitted that the plan, that the Developer submitted, provides sufficient information for us to recommend approval of the Residential Planned Unit Development zoning. It is not, however, sufficient for approval as the Master Plan. The existing road system in this area consist of a series of residential streets that do not have sufficient traffic capacity to convey the amount of traffic generated by a development of this scale, and are less than the minimum geometric requirements for the volume of traffic that is anticipated. Ms. Davis went on to say that they have added some stipulations to the rezoning. They are recommending denial if the stipulations are not included. Comments from the Flood Control Division are that there are no known drainage or flooding concerns that would preclude the proposed zone change for these parcels. No information was submitted in support of the site plan and there is no indication of how drainage will be handled. It was also noted that the applicant should be informed of the following: 1. Because of the size of the development, and the fact that it will be done in phases, a master drainage plan and study is required. An approved drainage plan is required before developing phase 1. Of the project. 2. The approval of the zone change for the parcel does not constitute approval of the site plan. 3. The development will require on-site drainage improvements and may require off-site drainage improvements. Staff recommends approval with stipulations. ***Recommended Stipulations: 1. A Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) for the development shall be submitted before the Master Plan is approved. At least the following routes shall be included in the analysis: a) Webb Drive to SR260; b) Wagon Wheel Lane to SR260; c) Rim Road via Wagon Wheel Road to SR260; d) White Pine Drive via North Drive and Cub Lake Road to SR260; any regional through routes identified in the White Mountain Regional Transportation Plan, which are in or adjacent to the proposed development area; and f) others as identified in the reconnaissance for the study. The TIA shall clearly demonstrate that these routes provide not less than Level of Service C at full build-out. Arizona Department of Transportation and Navajo County may be able to furnish some recent traffic counts for these streets and highway. We anticipate that this proposed development will generate approximately 3100 vehicle trips per day, and 300-460 peak hour trips, at full build-out as presently proposed. (Categories 210 and 230, "Trip Generation", Institute of Transportation Engineers) 2. All required offsite improvements; including, but not necessarily limited to, traffic signals, construction of Collector streets to the regional arterial system, and right-of-way acquisition; identified in the TIA shall be constructed or financially assured before the stage of the development is constructed that first requires the improvement. 3. The Developer should demonstrate that collector street access is available to any adjacent developable land. 4. All technical requirements of the Subdivision Regulations shall be met before approval of the Master Plan. Variances shall be requested and justified for the entire development in the Master Plan, and repeated with each of the phases they apply to. 5. Sufficient off-road drainage easements shall be made available to accommodate major drainage. It may be possible to accommodate the required roadway widths and utilities within the existing road rights-of-way, but not major surface drainage. An acceptable master drainage plan, that addresses drainage in all phases of the development, shall be required before any development begins. Drainage improvements may be required beyond the limits of a given phase of development, as a condition of approving the development. 6. The Zone Change/Master Plan approval is conditional upon the submittal of the Tentative Plat for Phase I to the Planning & Zoning Commission, along with the above stipulations, within 24 months of the date of approval by the Board of Supervisors. In the event all the above conditionals are not met, this approval shall be automatically revoked and the zone change shall revert back to A-General. This condition shall be conclusively deemed to have been satisfied unless the Board of Supervisors causes a notice of revocation to be recorded in the Office of the Navajo County Recorder within 30 days after the expiration of the 24-month period (or any extension thereof).*** **Jon Olson** asked if the recommendation of approval was for the Zone Change and Master Development Plan or the Zone Change only. **Lissa Davis** answered that it was for the Zone Change and the Master Development Plan. **John Murphy** stated that he is with the company Murphy Engineering Group and he is representing Steve Kohner as his

consultant for this project. They are asking for a Zone Change for a 161 acres development site along the rim between Webb Drive and Wagon Wheel Road. The proposed development will consist of single-family residential lots (approximately 214). The average in size is one half acre. There are approximately 178 multi-family townhouses and condominium units that will be placed on 20 acres portion of the site. Access to the site will be provided by two fully developed, county improved and maintained roadways that will meet county standards. The emergency access will be provided in three other locations via an easement that will be created (Mr. Murphy showed on the map where the easement would be created). Mr. Murphy stated that they feel that the use that they planned is best and highest use for the property and will be a big advantage and compliment to the area. Mr. Murphy indicated that they fully understand the stipulations that Public Works and Development Services had expressed and are willing to comply by them. **No one came forward to speak in favor of this project.** **Chris Lyle** spoke in opposition of the project. Mr. Lyle stated that he resides at 6631 Webb Drive (showed on the map where he resides) and he felt that there was not enough time given to the residents to voice their objections to this project. Mr. Lyle explained that Rim Road is on the Forest Service property not on the reservation. However, on the North it does go through some of the reservation. Mr. Lyle expressed some concerns about the road possibly needing to be widened for traffic. Mr. Lyle said other concerns were the trees being taken out, drainage and the diseased trees. **Tom Hieb** stated that before development begins they need to do a Traffic Impact Analysis and Master Drainage Study. They would have to do this and meet all of their standards before any permits would be issued. **Lance Payette** explained that the Master Site is just a general site plan as the developer develops each phase, that phase developed as a subdivision and the developer will handle the subdivision plat and the subdivision regulations and all the concerns will be addressed at that time. Mr. Payette explained that a lot of the various specific concerns will be addressed at each phase is developed as opposed to the stage where they are tonight. **Judy Abend** spoke in opposition of the project. Ms. Abend stated that she resides at 6651 White Pine Drive. Ms. Abend showed on the map where she resides. She expressed her concerns about the traffic and the density. **Ben Dunsey** spoke in opposition of the project. Mr. Dunsey showed on the map where he resides and questioned why the developer did not develop Rim Road, and move traffic away from Webb Dr and Wagon Wheel. Mr. Dunsey also expressed concerns regarding traffic. **Carrie Swanson** spoke in opposition of the project. Ms. Swanson stated that she resides at 6683 White Pines Drive. Ms. Swanson expressed her concerns about the increase of traffic. **Patricia Shuey** spoke in opposition of the project. Ms. Swanson reiterated the previous comments of the increase traffic and congestion. **Patricia Evans** spoke in opposition of the project. Ms. Evans stated that she lives on 6415 Webb Drive. Ms. Evans expressed her concerns with the traffic on Webb Drive being heavy and this will increase it. Ms. Evans other concern were that they would take ten feet of her property and they would place the road in front of her property. **Mary J. Bartlett** spoke in opposition of the project. Ms. Bartlett stated that she resides at 6004 Crimson Oak and it is right off Webb Drive. Ms. Bartlett stated that if they took ten feet and widen Webb Drive it would take out their fruit trees along the front of their property. Ms. Bartlett indicated that she would like half-acre lots instead of the small lots or multi-family. Ms. Bartlett suggested if the developer develops lots less than half-acre lots then it would lower the property values. **Don Schrork** spoke in opposition of the project. Mr. Schrork stated that he resides at 6298 Webb Drive. Mr. Schrork addressed his concern pertaining to speeding, population density, road rage and traffic. **Thomas Abend** spoke in opposition of the project. Mr. Abend suggested a traffic survey should be done in the summer rather than the winter. **Steve Kohner** is the applicant and he was in attendance. Mr. Kohner stated that they have developed properties in Coconino, Apache, Gila, Navajo County and Pinal County. Mr. Kohner indicated that on some of their developments they had a lot of opposition and the Commission and the Board of Supervisors approved them. Mr. Kohner explained that their concerns are how many trees can they reserve and keep and what is the best way to design the road to maintain that and the best drainage. Mr. Kohner explained that they are planning on putting in sewer. Mr. Kohner stated that the impact of the property increases the value of your property. **John Olson** explained that the developer has the right to develop the property and the commission is looking at right now on how would they like to see it developed and is to see if it is appropriate. **John Dalton** agreed that this development would have an impact on the people living in front of it. Mr. Dalton said that when the property owners moved in they impacted someone else. Mr. Dalton indicated that the applicant does have the right to develop his property and they do have the right to develop it in the special way that they want to. Mr. Dalton said that the developer would have to meet the criteria standards of the county. They will have to have the drainage problem solved, the road widths and traffic analysis done. Mr. Dalton also said that he would like to see Rim Road improved. Mr. Dalton said that two roads into each subdivision are required and the applicant has already met that criterion, and they are planning for water. Mr. Dalton also said that he doesn't think that the impact from the subdivision in front will be that great. Mr. Dalton explained that they may or may not take any property to construct the roads and the roads will be improved. Mr. Dalton stated that he is in favor of the project.

**Claire Heywood** stated as a person who would be interested in living in multi-family dwelling, because of her age and income bracket she finds it offensive that they would like to keep someone like herself out of the development.

Those kinds of dwelling appeal to people like her and people who reside in multi-family are not all rubbish. Ms. Heywood addressed the public that they need to consider other income groups and lifestyles and that your subdivision impacted people living here before you. Ms. Heywood stated that you can't stop development as soon as you move in because other people want to enjoy the access (forest, open space, birds and animals etc.). Ms. Heywood also said that she does not see this as blight because there are requirements that the applicants must meet. Wendell DeCross expressed his concern with the amount of traffic going out on Webb Lane. Mr. DeCross said that this is not a bad project but he is concerned with the amount of traffic. Mr. DeCross stated that he would like something done on Rim Road or some other access to get the traffic out from that particular half-mile section. Lance Payette stated that the traffic impact analysis is what gives them the legal foundation to be able to require the developer to do anything. All the points being made in the relation to the traffic are all followed in on stipulation number one. Jon Olson stated that he does like the idea of the zone change since the County had a lot of problems with wildcat subdivisions. Mr. Olson said that he would like to see more of the Master Development Site Plan. Mr. Olson said he didn't feel confident about approving the Master Development Site Plan. John Dalton agreed with Mr. Olson's last comment. Tom Hieb said Public Works was concerned with the lack of information on the Master Development Site Plan. John Dalton said that they should consider the Zone Change for tonight and the Master Development Site Plan come back at a later time. A motion was made by Frank Damato approve the Zone Change and to consider the Master Development Site Plan. Wendell DeCross seconded the motion. Motion unanimously carried.

**ITEM #4 AMENDMENT TO THE NAVAJO COUNTY ZONING ORDINANCE:** Discussion and possible Commission action on a request by Navajo County Development Services Department to amend the Navajo County Zoning Ordinance, by adding language to Section 2516 – Junk and Debris (this was continued from last month). Lissa Davis polled twelve counties excluding Maricopa and Pinal County. Ms. Davis went over the results of the survey with the commission. Ms. Davis said that the purpose of this amendment was to make it easier for the code enforcement staff to address complaints. Jon Olson indicated that he had some concerns with the amendment such as the definition of a fire hazard. Mr. Olson then read the definition and said that it was too vague. Lance Payette said that it would be a good idea to refer any complaints about fire hazards back to the fire districts, and then if the fire officials agreed action could be taken. Wendell DeCross said that he was concerned with the size of the parcel. Mr. DeCross commented that he thought that this was a start and he would hate to see this continuing to be tabled. Frank Damato said that the zoning ordinance should have something regarding fire hazards. A motion was made by Frank Damato to approve the Amendment to the Navajo County Zoning Ordinance to include the additional verbiage concerning who would determine a fire hazard, i.e. fire chief (As defined herein and concurrency with a fire department). ***Recommended Stipulations:*** 1. Unsightly, **UNSANITARY OR HAZARDOUS** accumulations of **JUNK; HOUSEHOLD GARBAGE; FECES; APPLIANCES OR FIXTURES; DISCARDED HOUSEHOLD ITEMS OR FURNISHINGS;** inoperable vehicles; vehicles undergoing major repair or restoration (**AS DEFINED HEREIN**); vehicle parts; **DISMANTLED MACHINERY; CONSTRUCTION MATERIALS; WOOD PALLETS; UNUSABLE FIREWOOD (AS DEFINED HEREIN); FIRE HAZARDS (AS DEFINED HEREIN AND WITH CONCURRENCY OF A FIRE DEPARTMENT); OLD APPLIANCES;** construction materials; and debris or other junk as defined in section 3002, **AS HOLES, TANKS AND CHILD TRAPS (AS DEFINED HEREIN)**, are prohibited except that junk is permitted in junkyards as defined in section 3002 **AND UNSIGHTLY BUT SANITARY AND NON-HAZARDOUS ACCUMULATIONS AND CONDITIONS ARE PERMITTED IN** other businesses where such accumulations **AND CONDITIONS** are necessary to the business (such as recycling facilities) and construction sites during the period of actual construction. ~~Any such~~ **UNSIGHTLY** accumulations that would be deemed offensive to a reasonable neighbor or passer-by, as determined by the Director, shall be removed, enclosed in a permanent structure or screened with conventional fencing materials in such a manner that they are no longer visible to neighbors or passers-by. **UNSANITARY OR HAZARDOUS ACCUMULATIONS AND CONDITIONS SHALL BE ELIMINATED AS ORDERED BY THE DIRECTOR.** The notice of violation shall specify with reasonably particularity the materials deemed to constitute the unsightly accumulation. **NATURE OF THE UNSIGHTLY, UNSANITARY OR HAZARDOUS ACCUMULATION OR CONDITION.**

2. For the purposes of this section:

1. "Abandoned or junk vehicle" means a vehicle or any portion thereof which is incapable of movement under its own power and will remain so without major repair or reconstruction. 2. "FIRE HAZARDS" MEAN ANY DEAD OR DYING TREES, BUSHES, STUMPS OR LIMBS; ANY ACCUMULATION OF DEAD ORGANIC MATTER AND YARD DEBRIS, INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, PINE NEEDLES, LEAVES, AND GRASS CLIPPINGS, BUT EXCLUDING MAINTAINED COMPOST AREAS. 3. "HOLES, TANKS, AND CHILD TRAPS" INCLUDES, BUT IS NOT LIMITED

**TO, HOLES, CISTERNS, OPEN CESSPOOLS, OPEN OR UNSANITARY SEPTIC TANKS, EXCAVATIONS, OPEN FOUNDATIONS, REFRIGERATORS, FREEZERS OR ICEBOXES WITH UNLOCKED DOORS.** 4. "Major repair" means the removal from any vehicle of a major portion thereof including, but not limited to, the differential, transmission, head, engine block, or oil pan. 5. "UNUSABLE FIREWOOD" MEANS ANY FIREWOOD THAT IS MORE ROT THAN WOOD AND NOT CUT INTO LENGTHS DESIGNED TO FIT AN APPROVED WOOD-BURNING STOVE. 6. "Vehicle" means any self-propelled device in, upon, or by which any person or property is or may be transported upon a public highway excepting devices moved by human power or used exclusively upon stationary rails or tracks.

3. All abandoned materials such as, but not limited to, home furnishings, machinery, wood, metal, plastics, and rubble shall be stored in an enclosed area by the owner or occupant of the property upon which the materials are located, in such a manner as to not be visible from any point lying without the property upon which the materials are located. Wendell DeCross seconded the motion. Motion unanimously carried.

ITEM #5 **AMENDMENT TO THE NAVAJO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN:** Discussion and possible Commission action amending the Navajo County General Plan adopting the Town of Pinetop-Lakeside/Navajo County Regional Plan. **Jon Olson** said that it was final in December of 2000. The Town of Pinetop-Lakes adopted this without any changes on January 18, 2001. A motion was made by Wendell DeCross to adopt the Amendment to the Navajo County's General Plan. Jon Olson seconded the motion. Motion unanimously carried.

ITEM #6 **Possible approval of September 19, 2002 Minutes.** A motion was made by Frank Damato to approve the minutes. Wendell DeCross seconded the motion. Tommy Joe, Claire Heywood and John Dalton abstained from voting since they were not in attendance for that meeting. Motion carried.

ITEM #6 **Commissioners Comments and/or Directions to Staff.** Commissioners may use this time to offer additional comments regarding any item on this agenda or any other topic; and the Commission may direct Development Services Department staff to study or provide additional information on topics of the Commissions choosing. Jon Olson explained that Ed Muder from the City of Show Low approached him since we just faxed them a Public Hearing Notice at the last minute. Mr. Olson commented that he would appreciate if staff would give them time to respond. Frank Damato said that a lot of time was wasted on redundancy. Mr. Damato commented that they talked about everything around the Special Development and the citizens concerns were negated by the stipulations. Mr. Damato said that when staff is making the presentation they need to clarify the stipulations better. Mr. Damato also talked about keeping the meeting in order and not letting the public go off track. **Lissa Davis** indicated that staff is working on a Matrix of Special Use Permits.

With there being no further business to come before the Planning and Zoning Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 10:07 p.m. Wendell DeCross made a motion to adjourn. Jon Olson seconded the motion. Motion unanimously carried. The Commission reserves the right to adjourn into an executive session when needed per 431.03(a)(3) for legal consultation on the above agenda items.

NOTE: a copy of the agenda background material provided to the Commission Members (with exception of material relating to possible executive sessions) is available for public inspection at the Development Services Office, Navajo County Complex, Holbrook, Arizona, Monday through Friday, 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Approved this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2002.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairman, Navajo County  
Planning & Zoning Commission

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary, Navajo County  
Development Services